

THE STANDARD

NO. 98-VOL. IV, NO. 20.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1888.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

"The Standard" is sent this week to a number of persons whose friends have paid for the paper forwarded to them for four weeks in the hope that they may be induced to read it, examine the principles it advocates and become regular subscribers. Those who receive the paper without having ordered it will understand that it has been sent in this manner and will be sent for four successive weeks without charge to them.

Terms of subscription will be found on the fourth page.

Subscribers of the "Chicago Enquirer" will receive "The Standard" until the expiration of their terms of subscription to that paper.

CONTENTS:

The Situation—The Reception Given to William Saunders of London by the Single Tax Men of New York. Who Said Defeat—Single Tax Letters from All Parts of the United States. Editorial Notes. An Unanswerable Question. A City (a poem). The Beating of the Drum. M. and Things. Fe. Ballot Reform. The Guilds of London. A Story for Workmen. Society Notes. Queries and Answers. In Rhode Island. Sanctum Sketches. The Mistake of Scripture. An Open Letter. Current Thought. Term (a poem).

I had intended, now that the campaign is over, to devote myself to THE STANDARD, which, while speaking, as I have been doing for some time, nearly every night, I have been forced in a measure to neglect. But my friend, Mr. William Saunders, has urged me to accompany him back to England, and the desire for the rest which I can get on an ocean steamer better than anywhere else, and the prospect of greeting my friends on the other side of the water, has induced me to sail with him on the steamer Eider to-morrow morning. I shall not stay more than a week or two in Great Britain, and expect to be back within thirty days. THE STANDARD will not be without something from me more than one issue following this, as I shall write from the other side.

The London correspondent of the Cork Constitution says:

It is generally believed that the land league was conceived by Michael Davitt, and founded by him in Dublin. This is a mistake. It was conceived by an English politician and planned at a house near London, at a "round table conference" composed of the English politician, the late Mr. A. M. Sullivan and Mr. Davitt. Probably if he were pressed on the point of paternity, Mr. Henry George would claim the questionable credit of authorship.

I do not think the credit of the authorship of the Irish land league to be in any degree questionable, and would be proud to have had a hand in it. But I had no hand whatever in it. The honor of it belongs principally to Michael Davitt on the other side of the water and Patrick Ford of the Irish World on this. Associated with Michael Davitt at the first meeting were John Ferguson of Glasgow and Thomas Brennan, now of Omaha, where he has made a fortune in land speculation, and one or two others whose names I forget. I do not think that Mr. A. M. Sullivan had a hand in it either. I never met Michael Davitt until his trip to this country in 1880, after the land league had been in existence for some time. I made Mr. A. M. Sullivan's acquaintance when he was member of parliament for Louth in 1881. He is a man for whose memory I cherish the most sincere respect; a clear headed, noble minded and warm hearted man, intense in his desire to secure freedom for Ireland, but yet broad enough to desire the same freedom for other countries as well. His death was a real loss.

The great misfortune of the movement which originated in the Irish land league is that the clear principle that the land of Ireland, like the land of every country, belongs in usufruct to the whole people, has not been kept in view. In its origination a movement for equal rights, it has to a large extent been dwarfed into a movement for merely reducing rents and establishing a peasant proprietary. The great danger of the Irish land movement now is that the conservative scheme to buy out the landlords in favor of the tenants will succeed. Under the Ashburne act quite a number of tenants have already bought their holdings, the government advancing the money; and it is proposed to extend this act into the next session. This scheme has the support of many men in the Irish movement, and it of course has the support of the landlords and of the Tory government; for while the landlords would thus be enabled to get full price for their estates at the expense and risk of the general taxpayer, the body of small owners thus created would for a long time constitute a strong barrier to any movement for the restoration of their rights to the rest of the people. If all the tenants of Ireland became the owners of their farms, it would not help those most needing help nor improve the condition of the masses of the people. The workingmen of the towns and the agricultural laborers of the country would be as badly off as before, and all that would be

accomplished would be the substitution of a larger class of landlords for a smaller class—the substitution of American landlordism for Irish landlordism. Some of the Irish papers are beginning to see this. The Cork Advertiser in a recent issue takes strong ground against the purchase bill and says:

The landlords have played their little game well, and it is not at all improbable that they will succeed. Their prospects of success are so good, in fact, that the whole business is becoming decidedly serious. The thin end of the wedge has been already inserted, and, if left to themselves, the landlords and their supporters, aided even by their political opponents, will in time succeed in driving the wedge home, or, in other words, succeed in establishing a system in this country that will make matters worse than ever. It is annoying to find a certain class of men one day arguing how grossly unjust were the governments that gave the land to the landlords, and the next day arguing how just it would be for the present government to give the land over in almost the same way to the tenants! If it is wrong for the landlords to own the land, it is just as wrong for the tenants—the only difference is that the latter wrong is more largely distributed among a greater number of people. If ever there was a time when the truth should be spoken throughout the length and the breadth of the country regarding land monopoly, now is the time. Land monopoly instead of being uprooted, as some say, is getting more firmly rooted every day. People console themselves with the thought that the establishment of peasant proprietary means the salvation of the country, and they close their minds altogether to the warnings of those who say that it will cause the country's ruin. They persist in ignoring the teaching that peasant proprietary is economically false and radically unjust. It is a time when the true character of peasant proprietary should be kept constantly before the public, in the hope that some day may be put on the extension of the scheme.

The Advertiser fears that the landlord scheme, aided by the support of a large section of the parliamentary party, may to a large extent succeed, but it warns the farmers who may be disposed to buy their landlords out that there can be no permanency in such a scheme, and that the land movement cannot end in a mere extension of the class of land owners. It says:

For the day cannot be far distant when the land, and the land only, will be taxed to meet the requirements of the state. They will then find out, to their cost, that they have been "fooled," woefully misled. Common justice, common sense, should convince those dupes that the tolling masses of England, Scotland, and Ireland will not permit the farmers to take absolute and free possession of the soil that God created for the benefit of all his creatures alike. Let them beware, then, and beware in time, for the schoolmaster is abroad and he is fast opening the eyes of the working classes (who now wield the power of the franchise, and enjoy the protection of the ballot) to the undeniable fact that they, too, have a deep and abiding interest in the just settlement of the land question, and that that abiding settlement rests only in land nationalization. This the landlords know full well. They are as convinced of this fact as Michael Davitt, and it is the knowledge of this fact that spurs and goads them to escape from the impending sweeping reform, caring little how their dupes may fare, and caring less for the country that unfortunately gave them birth. However, the farmers will only have themselves to blame if they rush blindly and blindly into the evil grasp of the Ashburne act.

The Advertiser quotes the objections that Mr. Alfred Russell Wallace makes to peasant proprietary, viz:

1. Because it will give to a class the future unearned increment of the land, which is the creation of the community.
2. Because every citizen ought to have equal right to the rental of his native land.
3. Because a peasant proprietary has no permanency, as the thriftless will be bought up by their neighbors, and landlordism be consequently re-established.
4. Because future land legislation will be rendered difficult, owing to the tenacity of the small proprietors, and thus the community as a whole will suffer for the sake of the minority.

These are all sound objections. Yet it is indicative of the timidity of thought which hampers the usefulness of so many men that Mr. Wallace, while he thus declares the injustice of giving to a class that "unearned increment" which is the creation of the community, and insists upon the equal rights of every citizen to that fund, will hear of no scheme for appropriating economic rent to common uses that does not involve compensation to the landlords for not permitting them to continue to keep it.

November 9. HENRY GEORGE.

Personal.

John Swinton, his many friends will be glad to learn, is recovering strength and eyesight, the operation which he underwent for cataract having been completely successful.

Judge James G. Maguire of San Francisco, who it was stated in THE STANDARD a few weeks ago had been requested to run to succeed himself as a judge of the superior court, declined to do so, preferring to go into practice again. This will have the advantage of freeing him for the visit to the east which it is hoped he will make ere long.

S. M. Burroughs, who generally stays in London, England, came home a short time ago in order to vote for Cleveland and take a hand in the single tax free trade fight. He spoke at a single tax meeting in his native town of Medina, N. Y., on Monday of this week. Mr. Burroughs's father at one time represented the Medina district in congress.

To Saratoga County Single Tax Friends.

BALLSTON SPA, N. Y., Nov. 11.—Please enter into correspondence with the undersigned for the purpose of devising means for a county organization. A large number is not needed. One of us who has seen the "best" would be a good nucleus, but of course "the more the merrier." Yours for the cause, RICHARD FERRY.

THE SITUATION.

POSITION OF THE SINGLE TAX IN ENGLISH AND AMERICAN POLITICS.

Significant Speeches at a Dinner Given to New York Single Tax Men to Mr. William Saunders of London—Mr. Saunders's Maxims—Address—Kingdoms of Henry George, Hugh O. Pentecost and John De Witt Warner—The Single Tax to the Front—Our Friends Across the Water—Fighting Our Fight—The Single Tax in Parliament—England Has a "Moral" Party, Too—Story of the Republican Party and the Bull Fight—What Will Save Us From the Tweeds—Time for Plain Speaking—Why Our Opponents Got There—A Scare Among the Monopolists—Political Corruption—A New Plan of Campaign—The Hope of the Future.

On Friday evening last more than fifty single tax men gathered in the New York hotel to pay their compliments to their brother at arms, Mr. William Saunders of London, with a modest little dinner. From their actions a stranger would never have suspected that only three days before these men had been beaten in a political contest. Their faces showed no trace of disappointment, no suggestion that they had in any way sustained defeat. On the contrary, one might have thought their cause had been awarded the glory of success.

They were indifferent to defeat—an indifference arising from a mastery of the situation and a firm hope in the future.

Henry George sat at the head of the chief table, with Mr. Saunders on his left and Mr. William T. Crossland on his right. Seated at the same table and at other smaller tables were:

W. J. Gorsuch, J. L. Dunham, C. O. C. Hennessy, Benj. Dobbin, Louis F. Post, John R. Dunlap, J. B. Dilworth, John DeWitt Warner, E. M. Kline, Rev. Arthur Whitaker, Geo. A. Hollis, Henry George Jr., Augustus Lewis, John P. Crawford, C. St. J. Leavens, M. J. Murray, Arthur Fiegel, Read Gore, E. B. Ingersoll, Lindley Vinton, Sam'l Shoup, F. C. Leubuscher, Thomas Doyle, Rev. H. O. Pentecost, Calvin Tompkins, Mannheim Bittner, P. J. Zaun, W. B. Scott, P. V. Jones, R. F. George, Thomas Davidson, J. B. Chapman, J. M. Harding, Rev. W. P. George, John Hickling, John Filmer, Alphonse Lewis, Richard F. Parrish, Edward A. McLean, J. M. Heard, Geo. White, Chas. H. Delano, C. M. Hibbard, W. Rogers, Wm. Hutton, M. R. Levermore, M. Battie.

Besides being a complimentary dinner to Mr. Saunders, the affair turned out to be a farewell reception to Henry George, who had determined within a few hours to cross the Atlantic with Mr. Saunders and pay a short visit to our friends in Great Britain.

The dinner itself was good but the speeches that followed it were magnificent. Why could their like be heard; such courage in defeat; such strength of purpose and unflinching zeal; such words of cheer and faith in the ultimate triumph of truth! Where but at such a time and in such a cause could such ringing words be heard!

After the cigars were lit, Mr. George arose and said:

Mr. Saunders is probably the most prominent man on the other side of the Atlantic who stands for our ideas. They have not as yet got to using the words that we now use—single tax and single tax men; but it is the same thing and the same end that he and those who are working with him are aiming at. Mr. Saunders has been one of the earliest and one of the best workers there.

They have a better system of elections over there than we have here. A man can be elected from any part of the kingdom to parliament. In the last parliament Mr. Saunders represented East Hull. For the present parliament he was defeated by some thirty-four votes out of 20,000; but he is now what in our parlance would be called the nominee, the candidate of the liberal party for the London district of Walworth, and also the nominated candidate of the same district for the great central municipal council, the governing body of the new London that has been created recently by parliament.

We greet Mr. Saunders to-night as a representative of our co-workers on the other side of the Atlantic. (Applause.) No American holding our ideas can go over to England and travel through it without feeling that it is his country also. (Applause.) From London and to John O'Grady's I have to say there is not a town or village that I could enter in which I would not find friends, men who would greet me as one of their own.

This fight unites us all. It is the democratic fight not only for the United States on the one hand and Great Britain on the other, but first of all the English peoples of the world, and then for all the rest. (Applause.)

We have just come through a campaign that has been enough if anything could be to make an American feel that his country (cries of "Hear, hear" and applause) is not merely the gross ignorance of the fool who riveted fetters upon their own limbs, nor merely the majority gained by intimidation and corruption, but the whole conduct of the campaign on the republican side, and especially those appeals to the vilest and meanest prejudices, the prejudices not merely of race—we are all really of the same race—but of nationality. A difference of three thousand miles of water, this is all the difference there is between us. Our blood comes from all the European people, but our language and our traditions we get from the United Kingdom. The Englishman who comes here mixes with the people here, and the American who goes there mixes with the people there; and both will feel that they are still flesh of one flesh and blood of one blood, the same language, the same thought and the same feelings.

And we who have been fighting in this campaign for the first time in the history of our reform that we who are here to-night ought to become free trade, had in it a higher object than the making of this country richer, than the making of it easier to live—the breaking down of prejudices, the fraternizing of peoples, the putting up as our ideals of something higher than this thing of merely to get rich, no matter at whose expense. And our friend, Mr. Saunders, we greet here to-night as one of ourselves.

We are glad to greet him as representing, not merely England, but the whole of the kingdoms; for he has been one of those democratic Englishmen who has been with Ireland from the first. (Applause.) We greet him as representing those people distinctively be-

cause they are separated from us; and in greeting him we mean to greet those who are behind him. The fight is the same in the three countries.

I went with this man eight years ago down into his native county of Wiltshire. And then I could understand where he drew that hatred of this accursed system that makes the majority of the people of both countries more tenants at will in what they call their native land. There I saw, and it may be seen all over the three kingdoms, it may be seen in this state and even in greater degree in our new states further west—thousands of acres lying idle, while men who ought to be making a living from them stand also idle, the dog in the manger holding them and preventing the application of labor to them, preventing the increase of wealth, simply standing between the hands that would gladly go to work and what God the Father had created for them to work upon.

I take pleasure in introducing to you tonight Mr. William Saunders of London. (Great applause.) I made a mistake; Mr. Saunders is more than a mere citizen of London. I should have introduced him as Mr. Saunders of Great Britain and Ireland. (Great applause.)

They call us cranks. Mr. Saunders is a representative of the British variety of (laughter.) He is one of the people from whom such men as Mr. Hewitt want to save society. (Laughter.) He is one of those disturbers and disorganizers. He is the man who got up the Trafalgar square meetings, and Saturday after Saturday persisted in speaking there in order to enforce the prescriptive right of the people to freely meet in public squares and voice their opinions or their grievances.

So I now introduce to you our brother of the new hope, our brother of the single tax, Mr. William Saunders of Great Britain and Ireland.

The guest of the evening arose to respond, but could not be heard for several minutes on account of the loud applause which greeted him. When he could be heard he spoke as follows:

Mr. Saunders's Address.

Mr. George and Friends: I am sorry that when you are kind enough to introduce me as "Mr. Saunders of Great Britain and Ireland," you do not also add "United States." (Applause.) I have gained a very large portion of my political experience on this side of the water, and I am sure you will pardon me if I say that I am as much at home on the other side of the Atlantic as I am on the other. (Applause.) One cannot be sometimes on one side and sometimes on the other of that water without feeling that the interests of the people on both sides are identical. (Applause.)

We are all fellow victims of unjust government. I have been a politician and I have watched the course of politics now for more than fifty years, and I am quite certain that the great cause of human unhappiness is unjust government. (Applause.) It is government for the benefit of the classes instead of government for the benefit of the masses. (Applause.) Both peoples suffer from precisely the same complaint, and community of misfortune ought to make a community of heart and interest, as in point of fact I feel certain that it does do. There is no difference whatever between the people of the United Kingdom and the people of the United States. (Applause.)

The only difficulty that arises is between those men who are generally misnamed practical politicians, as I said, for fifty years, and I am quite sure that they are not so wise as the people whom they regard as impractical and unreasonable politicians. At all events, those who assume the leadership of the people are constantly making obvious errors, and they make those errors because they do not trust the people and do not regard the interests of the people.

MR. GLADSTONE AND HOME RULE.

Now, Mr. George, you mentioned that I had always very great interest in the cause of Ireland, in the cause of home rule; and you will readily understand that the experience which I gained in this country of the practical working of your local and imperial institutions assisted me very greatly in the consideration of that matter. But some of my friends on this side of the water were surprised to find that when Mr. Gladstone brought in a scheme of home rule I was one of his opponents, in common with many other radicals of the United Kingdom. The point I wish you to clearly understand, because it is one of the greatest interest and importance in reference to English politics at the present time, is this: Why did I and some others oppose Mr. Gladstone's scheme of home rule? Because he connected with it two absolutely fatal principles. One was that the Irish people were to be excluded from representation in the imperial parliament, and the other was this: That the people of England were to be called upon to pay an enormous sum to the Irish landlords, a sum very far in advance of the price at which land was selling. Land at that time was selling at from seven to fourteen years' purchase; and Mr. Gladstone proposed that the people of England should pay to the landlords of Ireland twenty years' purchase.

IRISH LANDLORDS.

We could not contemplate for a moment the possibility of establishing any kind of government without representation. Any other course would contemplate the sacrifice of the people to a still further degree than they are already sacrificed for the benefit of landlords. (Applause.) An argument fatal to the interests of landlordism was urged in behalf of landlords in that particular matter. What they said was this: We must not make a change in the government of Ireland which will imperil the interests of the landlords of Ireland. That was the reason which was urged for giving the landlords of Ireland twenty years' purchase.

Why, I should like to know, are we to hesitate in the progress of government and take into special consideration the interests of the already most favored class of the community? Why? The reason is very obvious, and it is fatal to the claims of the landlords in this: The landlords have no practical basis for the claim which they raise. Their claim is exclusively a legal claim, and it is entirely an unjust claim. (Applause.) That is why these landlords were apprehensive.

The butchers and the bakers of Ireland were not apprehensive. They were quite willing that the change should take place. They were not afraid that they would not get paid. Why? Because they do not expect to get paid without rendering service. (Applause.) The landlords expect payment without rendering service; so they became afraid. (Applause.)

THE DEATH KNEEL OF LANDLORDISM. And I rejoiced in their apprehension. I feel that the use of that argument was the death knell of landlordism. They want payment without rendering service. They cannot have

it except at the expense of the community. They can only have it by the continuance of unjust legislation, and are apprehensive that when the people govern themselves, and when we really have government by the people and for the people, they are apprehensive that they will be left without payment. (Applause.) But no honest man is apprehensive that he will be left without payment. When the interests of the people are left in the hands of the people, to be used for the benefit of the people, everybody will get just payment. (Applause.)

That was the position in which as a radical and other radicals found ourselves when Mr. Gladstone brought in his home rule measure. I listened to every word that Mr. Gladstone said in reference to the Irish question. I was within ten feet of him during the whole time of his speaking, both in the great speech in which he introduced the measure and in his subsequent speeches. I was horrified when he announced those two propositions. I was delighted when a few days afterward he practically but thoroughly withdrew them. (Applause.) Mr. Gladstone is a man who very rapidly feels public opinion. He seems to have his finger on the public pulse and to know how things are going; and within three days of his making his great speech he saw that he had made a tremendous mistake in making those two propositions. What did he say in the house of commons? He said that "My scheme for the government of Ireland was prepared under the greatest pressure to which I had ever been subjected, and in preparing that measure I made proposals for the conciliation of powerful interests. Those proposals have not been accepted in the spirit in which they were made, and henceforth I appeal from the classes of England to the masses of England." (Great applause.) Then I was able to resume my complete allegiance to Mr. Gladstone and to give him my cordial support. (Applause.)

WORKINGMEN IN PARLIAMENT.

But in the interval a vast amount of mischief had been done. The parliament of 1885, which was elected under our new suffrage and also under a new bribery act, was by a long way the best parliament that we ever had in England. We had in that parliament twelve workingmen, twelve actual workingmen who were representing workingmen constituencies, and most of whom were paid salaries by their constituencies in order to enable them to devote their time to the interests of the working classes in the house of commons. The presence of those men in the house of commons was remarked upon by the speaker of the house, Mr. Peel, who is an aristocrat, and he observed that he had never before those men had added to the dignity and the business capacity of the house. (Applause.) That was a striking testimony and a testimony of great importance to us at the present time. But I think that those men, greatly as I admire their actions upon the whole, made a very serious mistake in this: When Mr. Gladstone brought in his Irish bill with those objectionable speeches, they said, We shall support Mr. Gladstone and the party notwithstanding the objectionable features; we will stand by the exclusion of the Irish members; we will vote for the twenty years' purchase because it was introduced by Mr. Gladstone.

Those twelve workingmen did the greatest harm to the liberal party that they possibly could do by taking that course; and it simply showed me that the very worst thing one can do is to support one's party when it is wrong. (Applause.) Lord Palmerston, who was one of the most judicious prime ministers we ever had, hesitated to observe that for his part he would support when he was wrong. He did not want it when he was right (laughter); and consequently that the true principle of party support was to support your leaders when they were wrong. (Laughter.)

A POLITICAL MISTAKE.

I think experience shows that that cynical observation of Lord Palmerston's has no foundation in fact; because what would have happened if those twelve workingmen and the radical members of the house of parliament had asserted that they would not vote for those two propositions? If they had taken that stand the result would have been that Mr. Gladstone would have changed his measure expeditiously and completely, and he would at the present moment be the prime minister of England. I feel quite sure that if Mr. Gladstone's followers had insisted upon his putting himself right at once he would have done so; but the fact that he was wrong and the workingmen members were prepared to support the liberal party in such measures has weakened the liberal party, and in the election which followed the liberal party was thoroughly defeated.

The lesson I have learned from this is merely a confirmation of what I have already said, and that is that sound principles can be the only foundation upon which a liberal party can be based. I know that a good deal of importance is attached to political organizations here, but in our country I speak from long experience—the liberal party has never wanted support when it has held up before the country measures that were worth supporting. (Applause.)

HOW MR. SAUNDERS RAN FOR PARLIAMENT.

Perhaps you will say, It is all very well for you to come and talk here about high principles, but you appear before us as a defeated candidate, and we want successful candidates. (Laughter.) That is not unreasonable. But perhaps you will allow me a moment to state exactly what my personal political principle is. I never sought to become a candidate for any office. I was requested at the election of 1885 to become a candidate for East Hull. I did so under the condition—and that is the only condition under which I shall accept any candidature—that the people themselves, the whole people, should decide the selection of candidates as well as the election of members. I shall not be the nominee of any caucus or any party, save only after holding a series of public meetings and being selected by the people. I became a candidate under those conditions. There were several other candidates. I was chosen after having announced the principles which we are here to discuss to-night in the fullest and most decided form. (Applause.)

We had a very curious contest. Hull was then divided into three divisions, but at the same time there was a kind of central committee which wished to govern the whole thing, but did not quite succeed. They said: "Now we have a radical in East Hull, and we must now have a good party man in Central Hull." Both these divisions were liberal in the election of 1880 by two-thirds majority. They were, as nearly as possible, even. In East Hull I was chosen, a thoroughgoing radical, in 1885; and in Central Hull they chose a man who made no claims to being a radical, and the result was that the radical of Central Hull, being so disgusted with his want of appreciation of some radical principles, determined to bring forward another candidate; and thus the party candidate was

defeated by a majority of 150, and I was elected by a majority of 605.

STRENGTH OF RADICALISM.

Then came the election of 1886, which took place under very peculiar circumstances. And the same thing happened again. The committee said, "Now we have Mr. Saunders as a thoroughgoing radical in East Hull, and we must take a very mild liberal for Central Hull." The result was I was beaten by 37 and the very mild liberal was beaten by 1,150. (Laughter.) So you see, after all, my record when it comes to be compared closely does not sound so very bad, and I am sure you will recognize the fact that I do not mention these matters to-night from any personal motive whatever, but merely because my defeat in East Hull is made great use of by some of the weak-kneed liberals in order to show that there is no strength in radicalism in the United Kingdom. I believe they are entirely mistaken in their apprehension; and I am quite sure that the liberal party will regain the government when they propose measures worthy the support of the people.

A CANDIDATE FOR WALWORTH.

One word more with reference to personal record. Of course the question came up should be selected as candidate for the next election, although that might not take place for four years. The selection took place last spring, and I was asked to become a candidate for the division of Walworth. I never moved a single inch toward the selection of a candidate. We went through the ordeal again. There were twenty-seven men who wished to become candidates for Walworth, and I believe most of them, if I may be allowed to say so, were really good men. At all events, twenty-seven men were anxious for the honor of being candidates for Walworth. Three men were selected, of whom I was one. My opponents were strong men indeed. Both of them were barristers, and, in our country, as I believe in yours, lawyers know how to talk better than other people. At all events they did talk exceedingly well; but when it came to votes I had about as many as both the lawyers (laughter and applause). Of course, considering that I was a very extreme man, that did not tell very much against radical principles. One of them the other day in talking to a friend made this observation. He said, "We have no chance against Mr. Saunders because the people recognize the fact that he is the man who stood up for the people's rights in reference to Trafalgar square." (Applause.) What does that prove against simply that if you will serve the people the people will serve you. (Applause.) I have never held before the community any other principle than that.

SINGLE TAX AND RIGHT OF PUBLIC SPEECH. I advocate the single tax because I know it is just and necessary for the people. (Applause.) I advocate and insist on the right of public meeting, because it is necessary for all principles of just and sound legislation. The Tories are exceedingly anxious at the present time to put a stop to public talk. They do not like these public meetings. They do not like their actions to be criticised. And it is a very curious circumstance that they are making use of the fact that we have a parliament elected on a broader suffrage than was known in our country previously. They make use of it in this way: They say that with such a democratic parliament anything may be done; and they have done many things which are entirely opposed to the interests of the people. They have turned themselves into angels of light for their own interests. They can see the advantages of democracy when they have control of it. (Laughter.) It is a very remarkable circumstance that the parliament of 1885 was the best that we have known in the present century, and the present parliament is the worst that we have known. It shows this, at all events, that we cannot depend on any system of representation.

RULED BY A MORAL PARTY.

The fact is that nothing will maintain the interests of the people of any country but a constant and intelligent attention to those interests on the part of the people. They cannot delegate those powers to any representative assembly except in an executive sense. It is the public opinion of the people which is the only safeguard of the interests of the people, and it is the only thing that can possibly secure good government. And that is why, Mr. George, I attach so much importance to your efforts and to the efforts of our friends of an educational character. (Applause.) Organization of course is of immense importance at certain periods; but what we must mainly depend upon is education. It is impossible to save an ignorant people from unjust legislation. (Great applause.)

Of course the conservative theory which prevails to such an extent in our country is a very attractive theory. It is just this: That the wisest and best people in the community should be the governors of the community. It is a very attractive theory. There is a great deal that can be said in favor of it. We have had three hundred years' experience in our country, and the result is this: That the wisest and best men, wise and good as they are, govern for their own interest and not for the interest of the people. (Applause.) And the wiser they are, the better they are, the stronger they are, the more they rob the people. (Applause and laughter.)

THE WAY THE THING WORKS.

Perhaps you think that is an exaggerated statement. (Cries of "Oh no.") Have you possibly had an experience of that character? (Laughter.) Let me tell you what it has brought us to in our country. Take the question of taxation and our position is exactly this: That where the privileged classes pay a shilling the industrial classes pay a pound. And then when it comes to the subject of remuneration exactly the reverse takes place (laughter); and where the working classes are paid a shilling the privileged classes are paid a pound. (Laughter.) Now that is not only no exaggeration, but it is a long way within the limits of the actual truth. But I won't ask you to take my word for it; it seems so extravagant that one can scarcely believe it; yet it is exactly so, only more so. (Laughter.) I will just give you two illustrations. I will take an illustration from a house in my neighborhood. There you will find this, that the owner of the lot will have a property say worth a thousand pounds, for which he has done no labor whatever. The owner of the house will have a property worth fifteen hundred pounds, a property in the accumulation of which there has been much labor. How about the taxation of those two properties? I am not going to give you speculative, but actual figures. At the present time the man who owns the thousand pounds worth pays in taxation fifteen shillings a year—three-quarters of a pound. In other words, the landlord's property is worth \$5,000 and he pays rather less than four dollars a year in taxation. The property of the builder who has worked for it is worth \$7,500, and he pays \$25 a year in taxes. I think you will see that my state-

lie
lie
wh

D3

sw
In
all
fact
the
ple
Wh
tha
den
ma
cal
me
Th
ou
sing
rig
the
ene
stre
wh
do

W
leas
som

SIDG

one
tha
of w
incr
the

value
 Ew-
 that
 tax
 the
 the
 and
 lucer
 purp
 can
 we
 need
 As
 call
 He
 ye
 Mr.
 Th
 when

Mr
 invit
 free
 marry
 I af
 as lo
 thing
 sir, b
 as it
 word
 that
 ever
 the w
 publi

people
for the

The
 (App
 essen
 free t
 Reve
 of the
 time a
 (App
 And
 exten
 reven
 which
 and i
 and is
 to the
 prise
 polit
 Now
 advan
 copies
 preced
 seeme
 of her
 paigu
 for d
 sur, do
 as a d
 the st

First

too p
party
beate
the ch
at its
which
of our
a defe
and r
which

and de

bury, 48
to att
up to
four y
presid
upon t
of dem
is that
serves
in New
ing. I
our an
that u
that i
we sh
RESIDE

Again
tempor
in the
courage
As far
politics
But the
in my l
confer
much o
that th
tious s

Die. 1

stood in
while I
it—at
ules. I
to den

though

the sm
evenly
seems d
princip
charges
and sch
in the n
ammon
we hav

consider

But, s
have cr
—that i
princip
method
the succ
to prove
method
us, and
“get the
so see if
for it, t
men wh
ing to w

The Italian custom house, however, levied import duty on the body when it came to the country, and the same amount export duty when the ashes were taken back to the place.

We were told that we should not fear ridicule for teaching the truths of the single tax. That is true. But we should fear ridicule for the way in which we teach them. The engineers of the united labor party proposed to teach these truths by throwing the influence of the organization in favor of the doctrine of protection, which is diametrically and unalterably opposed to the single tax; they proposed to stand before the public as a third party, but secretly to solicit votes for the protection party; they proposed to hold the free traders of the party away from the democrats by the tie of party al-

The Harlem democratic club has undertaken a gigantic task in attempting to draft an electoral reform bill that shall not be obnoxious to Governor Hill's veto of the Saxton bill. Unless Governor Hill has changed his opinions about ballot reform, and, in view of his success in electing himself and defeating Cleveland under the present system, there is no reason to suppose he has, the Harlem club has undertaken an impossibility. It may draw an electoral bill which will not be obnoxious to the governor's objections, but there cannot be any reform in such a bill. It is not generally known, but it is a fact, that the governor's objections went to the heart of the Saxton bill. He made a great variety of objections to details, which might be changed; but his principal objections, if sound, were vital. We hope the Harlem club will not be discouraged, and shall be glad to see it

In this light the *Sun* will be the organ of the tory democrats. It has already begun to prophecy that there will not be another educational campaign; but prophecy is not the *Sun's* best hold. It is much handier with the stiletto.

Free trade is not dead; but an outspoken

What wise millionaire, what rich and great philanthropist, desirous of being the benefactor of the human race, of putting an end to hunger and poverty, will come forward and lay hold of this unexampled opportunity to gain for himself imperishable renown, and to confer upon his grateful countrymen the

The Independent Single Tax men have apparently been stirred up, not down cast, by the result of the election. The *Sentinel* reports that city published a call for a meeting of citizens to be held in one of the court rooms on Saturday of last week to discuss the Australian ballot as well as "protective tariffs and all other enigmas for the subjection of the many to the few." The call was signed by an active worker, Tom Marley.

There are not a few who will agree with Colonel Higginson that Mr. Cleveland is the leader in a battle yet to be fought out, and that his "career is just beginning." Higginson himself is not at the beginning of his career, but he is not so near it as General Banks, who has just defeated him for congress.—(Philadelphia Times.

Another s
ocean steam
hours' sail
Umbria era
beria, cutti

